



Board Governance Notice and Policy 103 Complaint

HOMS / Title IX Process Collapse, Integrity Breakdown, and Finality Failure

Date submitted	June 21, 2026
Requested response date	June 21, 2026
Deadline basis	Minn. Stat. 13.03, subd. 2(a): requests must be received and complied with "in an appropriate and prompt manner."
Sender	[REDACTED]
Recipient	PLSAS School Board; Dr. Wagner; current Responsible Authority / authorized designee
Scope	HOMS / Title IX Process Collapse, Integrity Breakdown, and Finality Failure

This cover page is an index aid. The formal request body follows on the next page and controls the specific scope, authorities invoked, and requested action.

Board Governance Notice: HOMS / Title IX Process Collapse, Integrity Breakdown, and Finality Failure

Dear Chair, Members of the School Board, Dr. Wagner, and current Responsible Authority / authorized designee:

I am submitting this as a Board governance notice concerning the District's maintained HOMS Maltreatment Report, HOMS Investigation Process Report, Title IX dismissal/access posture, related source-record productions, and later finality/good-faith statements.

This notice is not asking the Board to adjudicate every underlying FERPA, MGDPA, Title IX, maltreatment, discipline, bullying, weapons, or personnel issue in one response. Indeed, the facts presented here are independent of the merits of those underlying issues and are based on how the produced record universe shows the District processed, routed, documented, redacted, disclosed, withheld, denied, closed, or failed to disposition them. It is also not asking the Board, in this notice, to decide the merits of the underlying investigations themselves. It asks the Board to recognize that, taken at face value, the District's own produced record universe, as it exists today unamended, shows a board-level governance, liability, and humane-response concern even before reaching the merits: the District appears to have repeatedly used unsupported process labels, unsupported role assignments, unsupported redactions, unsupported legal-determination claims, and unsupported finality statements to avoid accounting for a key HOMS/Title IX record universe involving serious harm to a student.

This notice is also submitted, to the extent PLSAS treats it as a complaint regarding policy-controlled conduct by District administrators, compliance officials, or other employees, as a complaint under Policy 103. If the District contends another specific policy procedure governs any portion of this complaint, Policy 103 requires the District to route that portion through the specific applicable policy procedure. For any portion not governed by a more specific procedure, Policy 103 requires investigation or follow-up and a written response concerning the outcome, including any appropriate action or corrective measure, consistent with applicable privacy law.

This transmission and its attachment contain private data about me and my minor child, including private education data and personally identifiable information from education records. I do not consent to the sharing, forwarding, review, consultation, disclosure, or use of this data with or by any person or entity that is not category-mapped to a valid District-published, District-maintained FERPA exception applicable to the relevant school year and record universe.

If the District discloses or permits access without consent, please preserve and identify the maintained basis for that access, including the recipient, role, purpose, record category, applicable FERPA/MGDPA authority, annual-notice category, category mapping, legitimate educational interest, and any direct-control or redisclosure limitation relied upon.

Governance Concern

The issue is no longer only whether one particular redaction, denial, or production was wrong. The issue is that the District's represented record universe, as it exists today unamended, creates the following chain:

1. A single staff resource appears in the produced universe as investigator and decisionmaker for relevant investigations while also serving as Title IX Coordinator, raising a role-separation problem for any maintained record treating the Title IX dismissal, closure, appeal posture, or access denial as facially valid or final.

2. The HOMS Maltreatment Report concerns a parent's complaint about multiple school staff failing to comply with mandated-reporting duties and about alleged negligent failure to see or intervene in successive assaults involving [REDACTED] being struck over the head with a chair.
3. The superintendent acknowledged receiving a "maltreatment report" and committed to processing it, but the next email characterized the complaint as submitted under Policy 103 and processed accordingly.
4. Policy 103 requires routing to more specific policy procedures when applicable, and the HOMS Maltreatment Report itself identifies Policy 414 as reviewed during the investigation. After reviewing Policy 414 against the multiple maltreatment/failure-to-report issues at hand, the District nevertheless appears to have treated generic Policy 103 as the better fit, even though the produced Policy 103 definition section contains no operative definition beyond the heading "Definition."
5. The represented production universe does not show MDE routing or MDE review for the maltreatment/failure-to-report issue, even though maltreatment-report failure or occurrence involving school staff carries statutory and policy-sensitive external-review and parent-notification implications.
6. The parents were given a report containing the word "Conclusion," but the entire conclusion was redacted and staff names other than the investigator were redacted, preventing the parents from verifying which complaints, staff actors, conduct categories, or conclusions were actually investigated.
7. The visible substantive content of the HOMS Maltreatment Report appears to emphasize that [REDACTED] did not report the incident until the next day, while the unredacted text does not show clear treatment of the alleged failure to intervene in the second assault or the alleged failure to report after notice of [REDACTED] assault. In other words, as produced, the visible report appears to imply that it is the fault of the neglected student for not telling the teacher who neglected them sooner.
8. The parent identified these HOMS records as key Title IX records multiple times.
9. When the parent first identified that key-record status within a formal request, the District closed the Title IX investigation on a failure-to-identify-respondent basis without producing records showing meaningful investigation activity in the preceding months, and in the same response sequence used the Title IX dismissal/closure posture to deny appropriate access to the key record.
10. When the parent requested disclosure logs for these documents, the District represented that a chief legal attorney had made a Minnesota Statutes section 13.39 determination and that the disclosure log, despite being a statutory access/accounting obligation, had been gathered in preparation for civil-litigation defense and was not available to the parent.
11. When asked to produce records demonstrating that determination, the District responded that no responsive records existed.
12. When asked to produce records demonstrating that the District had designated anyone as a chief legal attorney for the relevant year, the District substituted a generic list of law firms approved by the Board to work with the District, then stood behind that production with all-requests-answered/no-additional-responsive-data finality.
13. When the parent submitted correction requests targeting these records, one was met with a blind rejection asserting that the maintained data were not inaccurate, not incomplete, and not misleading, without any produced source records contradicting the evidence the parent provided or any records demonstrating that a source-comparison investigation occurred at all. The other was ignored or not processed on the basis that it was "not a Title IX complaint," even though it raised maintained-record correction, access, appeal, statement-of-disagreement, and source-record issues.
14. After the six-month period for requesting older data again had elapsed, the parent requested these records and all records relating to or relied on by them. Neither produced record universe contained the parent's statements of disagreement, neither of the complaints disputing the records was provided, and the production did not include

records explicitly identified on each report as records that were reviewed, even though the District has made multiple all-responsive-records, all-requests-answered, and finality statements about that production.

15. After receiving that faulty Kally production, the parent began requesting a non-implicated routing and decision-making channel for the correction, access, appeal, source-record, and process-integrity disputes. As of June 21, 2026, the District has not provided a single record demonstrating any response to or review of that request.

16. When the parent then requested records demonstrating the search, routing, review, processing, and production basis for the preceding production, the records provided appeared to represent that the records in question magically attached themselves to the District's responsive dataset without anyone ever searching for them, asking about them, discussing them, reviewing them, excluding them, withholding them, or otherwise dispositioning them.

17. The parent has made two separate attempts to appeal, and both were denied on timeliness grounds. As of June 21, 2026, the District has produced no record demonstrating that appeal notice was ever provided to the parent concerning the Title IX complaint. On May 16, 2026, the parent submitted a request for records demonstrating the review process performed before the second untimely rejection, including appeal-review, role-separation, decision-maker, conflict/bias review, written-result, written-rationale, and related decision-process records.

18. When these records were later requested again, along with all records showing processing, search, routing, review, production, withholding, source-document consideration, appeal-notice transmission, appeal-processing, investigative action, or other records related to them, the production still did not include records demonstrating intake, review, consideration, processing, source-document touch, appeal-notice transmission, or pre-denial investigative/search activity sufficient to support the District's continued finality/timeliness/good-faith posture. Requests for records concerning the District's last production that failed to provide appeal-notice evidence have also been ignored and are now more than a month expired.

19. Throughout the sequence, the District continued to maintain finality, all-records-produced, fulfilled-request, good-faith, burden, nonreciprocity, or nuisance-type framing of the parent. If the District's current statements are to be believed, the District's present position is that requests received between May 28 and June 10, 2026 may be handled on a rolling basis through August 26, 2026, which is 76 days after Rob Cothorn's June 11, 2026 email and 66 days after this notice. Even then, the family would merely be able to continue processing the records, correction, appeal, and source-accounting issues and move toward completion.

20. The family has made three follow-up requests for the District to acknowledge the May 16, 2026 request for records demonstrating the appeal-review and decision-making process. As of June 11, 2026, the District has entered an entirely non-responsive posture and has not engaged on any of the pressing matters at hand. As of June 21, 2026, the parents are still awaiting acknowledgement or production of this request.

Taken together, this is a board-level problem. It is not enough for the District to say the parent disagrees with conclusions. The produced record universe now raises whether the District used generic process labels and unsupported legal/process claims to block access to the records needed to test its own claims.

It is also a humane-response problem. The District's refusal or failure to properly disposition the Title IX, appeal, access, and source-record lanes has forced my family to spend more than a year and a half trying to get the District to account for basic process, access, appeal, source-record, and child-safety issues. A Title IX process, and the related access/appeal process needed to test it, should be properly disposed long before a family is required to keep litigating the existence, routing, redaction, and finality basis of the same key records for this long.

This notice also does not attempt to exhaust the privacy issues created by the same record universe. The governance concern described above exists even before accounting for the privacy violations inherent in

unsupported or shifting role mappings, including access by persons or roles not category-mapped to a valid District-published FERPA exception for the relevant year and record universe. It also exists before accounting for the separate evidence concerning the School Board email bounceback anomaly and the related pattern of misleading, incomplete, or unsupported productions and finality statements in that lane. Those privacy/access-routing issues are separate concerns, but they reinforce the same governance problem: the District should not maintain finality, good-faith, lawful-access, or all-records-produced statements while the produced universe lacks the role-mapping, routing, transmission, access-basis, search, and production records needed to test those statements.

Likewise, this notice does not attempt to resolve whether the HOMS, maltreatment, discipline, bullying, weapons, or Title IX investigations reached the right substantive outcome. The threshold governance problem is simpler and earlier: the District has not produced or identified the process, source, role, routing, notice, access, redaction, and legal-determination records needed to make its maintained finality and good-faith posture reviewable. If that threshold record cannot be supported, the Board should not require the family to first relitigate the merits of each investigation before the District accounts for how those investigations were routed, documented, closed, redacted, and used to deny access.

This notice also does not attempt to exhaust failures in the separate bullying/weapons investigation lane. The HOMS Investigation Process / weapons record universe raises its own issues concerning complaint scope, source records, Policy 501/506/506.1 treatment, safety/accommodation conclusions, staff/witness accounting, redaction, access, and finality. Those issues are not waived or narrowed by this notice. They matter here because they show that the HOMS/Title IX governance problem is not isolated to the maltreatment report or one Title IX summary; even without fully accounting for the bullying/weapons lane, the District's source-support and finality posture is already board-level.

The volume of pending correction pressure matters. The current Title IX summary correction workspace tracks 15 mapped strike items against the March 13, 2025 Title IX summary / dismissal / appeal / access / finality universe. Those items include misleading, inaccurate, incomplete, or source-unsupported maintained-record issues concerning appeal-right notice, dismissal-source basis, equal access to key records, participation/access path, respondent-identification predicate, "crucial information" wording, enrollment/timing language, staff/witness universe, policy/procedure accounting, legal-consult/complete-file accounting, counsel-access mapping, section 13.39/chief-attorney provenance, appeal-denial process, protected-activity/deferral risk, and records-response finality. That count is not offered as a merits ruling on each issue; it is offered to show that the District's own pending correction queue is no longer compatible with broad, unqualified finality or good-faith framing.

The District's newer nonresponsive posture compounds the same governance problem. This notice sits on top of a documented pattern in which multiple requests have already expired or matured without request-specific production, no-responsive-data statements, statutory withholding bases, duplicate/fulfilled source locators, or meaningful expected-date treatment. Prior Board-routed correction transmittals documented a live tracker showing 30 active matured request/status rows and only one substantive District request response after the May 29 consolidated/reset cycle: Robert Cothorn's June 11 `PLSAS Data Requests` email. That response supplied one Kally-linked production and broad categorization/finality framing, but did not map most request IDs to production, no-data, withholding, duplicate/fulfilled, create-data, civil-investigative, privileged, public, private/data-subject, or correction treatment. The District's continued nonresponse to later source, search, processing, appeal, and investigative-action requests therefore does not sit beside the HOMS/Title IX finality problem; it aggravates it.

The Kally production creates an additional finality problem. Kally Venteicher represented that all responsive data had been provided, but the production did not contain my statements of disagreement or the complaints that accompanied them, even though those complaints and disagreement statements were plainly records relating to

the investigations, corrections, appeals, source-record disputes, and finality posture at issue. A later production that purported to show search and processing logs for that faulty response likewise did not contain records showing that those statements of disagreement, accompanying complaints, or related source documents were searched for, discussed, reviewed, withheld, excluded, or dispositioned. The District nevertheless continued to back the production universe with all-responsive-data-provided, all-requests-answered, fulfilled-request, and finality language. That is a second independent concealment/finality layer: the District not only omitted records that should have been part of the investigation/correction universe, but later produced process records that still did not show the omitted records were ever handled.

The correction-response lane itself also requires Board review. One correction request was denied with a conclusory assertion that the maintained data were not inaccurate, not incomplete, and not misleading, without produced records showing what investigation occurred, what source records were reviewed, or how the District evaluated that assertion against the record sources and contradictions identified in the complaint. Another related correction/access lane was not processed at all because the District characterized it as "not a Title IX complaint" and stated it did not need to respond, even though the submission raised maintained-record correction, access, appeal, statement-of-disagreement, and source-record issues. Those two responses are not source-supported dispositions. They are themselves maintained records that either need to be supported with intake, review, investigation, source-comparison, decision, and appeal/hearing-right records, or corrected/qualified as unsupported finality assertions.

The maltreatment/parent-notification problem is also not resolved by public-data breadcrumbs. Because the District did not provide a meaningful unredacted maltreatment conclusion or adequate parent-notification channel under the applicable maltreatment-reporting law and policy framework, the parents were forced to use public-data requests to learn even basic accountability facts. Through that route, the parents identified public data indicating that there was one complaint involving the allegedly negligent teacher, that the investigation was completed, and that it resulted in no discipline or training. In practical terms, the only reason the parents can see that any investigation into that matter occurred is because the parents pushed for records. The record as produced appears consistent with the District absolving itself, but the parents cannot test that conclusion to the level needed for responsible action because the actual conclusion, scope, source comparison, and staff-specific analysis remain redacted or unaccounted.

The length and structure of the HOMS Maltreatment Report reinforce the scope concern. The produced report is approximately a page and a half long, including process description and other non-conclusion material. That might be enough space for a single superficial maltreatment review, but it is difficult to understand how it could meaningfully document an investigation into multiple staff actors spanning both a failure-to-report channel and a staff-negligence channel. If the District maintains that the report fully and accurately resolved those distinct issues, the District should identify the records showing which staff were investigated, what allegations were investigated for each person, what source records were reviewed, what findings were made, what conclusion applied to each allegation, and what parent notice was provided.

There is a narrower suspicion that must be preserved carefully rather than overstated. Based on District statements concerning why Scott Peterson did not file a report, and when compared against the record that no report was filed even after the District later acknowledged receiving notification, the current produced universe raises a serious concern that no true investigation occurred into Scott Peterson's or Joe Kuboushek's possible failure to report during the November 1 through November 14 period despite multiple notifications of the incidents appearing in the record. I am not asking the Board to treat that suspicion as proven in this notice. The point is narrower: as of June 21, 2026, the District has produced no records showing otherwise. The District has made it impossible for the parents to responsibly confirm or rule out that concern because the maintained conclusion, source records, staff-specific findings, and routing/notice records remain redacted, omitted, or unsupported by

produced process records.

The intake and review channel problem is part of the same current governance failure. I have repeatedly asked the District to identify or provide a records/correction/intake/review channel that is not itself materially implicated by the matters being investigated, corrected, appealed, or source-accounted. The District has not provided that unconflicted channel. Instead, the same general response universe continues to route, review, characterize, delay, deny, or leave unanswered requests that seek records about the conduct, role mappings, access bases, redactions, legal determinations, finality statements, and process failures of the actors or offices involved in that response universe. A Board-level review is required because a process cannot be treated as neutral, final, or good-faith supported while the District refuses to identify a non-implicated intake and review path for disputes about that very process.

Why Board Review Is Required

The Board should not treat this as ordinary records-request friction. The chain involves child safety, alleged staff negligence, alleged mandated-reporting failure, Title IX access, Policy 103 routing, Policy 414 review, apparent selection of a generic policy lane whose produced definition section did not supply an operative definition, MDE-routing implications, bullying/weapons investigation spillover, staff-identity redactions, fully redacted conclusions, statutory disclosure-log access, claimed 13.39 civil-investigative treatment, chief-legal-attorney designation, and later District finality/good-faith statements.

Nor should the Board treat the time burden as a neutral administrative side effect. The District's maintained process has required the parent and student to live inside the unresolved aftermath of the underlying harm, the redacted report, the Title IX closure, the appeal posture, and the records-access disputes for more than a year and a half. Whatever the District's litigation or records position may be, a public school district should not require a family to carry that unresolved procedural burden indefinitely before it gives a source-supported, humane, and reviewable answer.

Nor should the Board treat the lack of an unconflicted intake/review channel as an administrative inconvenience. Where the data-practices, Title IX, legal-review, redaction, role-mapping, and finality actors or offices are themselves implicated by pending correction and access issues, the District must provide a channel capable of receiving, preserving, reviewing, and routing the matters without making the implicated process the sole gatekeeper of its own review.

If the District's current produced universe, as it exists today unamended, is accurate, the Board should be concerned that key decisions were made or maintained without records showing the necessary role separation, routing, external review, legal designation, legal determination, redaction basis, disclosure-log basis, or source-record accounting.

If the District's current produced universe is incomplete and requires amendment, correction, qualification, or supplementation, the Board should be concerned that the District has repeatedly represented production as final, complete, fulfilled, or good-faith supported while omitting the records necessary to substantiate those representations.

Either way, the governance risk is current. The District is still maintaining records and statements that characterize the parent, the requests, the Title IX dismissal, the HOMS/Maltreatment process, the redactions, and the District's good faith.

That risk is heightened by the current nonresponsive posture. A Board should not allow the District to continue using finality, good-faith, burden, nonreciprocity, or nuisance-type framing while multiple expired or mature requests remain undispositioned and while later requests for the source/search/processing records needed to test those statements are themselves met with silence, incomplete production, or unsupported finality.

Requested Governance Action

Please preserve and route this notice to the full Board, Dr. Wagner, the current Responsible Authority or authorized designee, the Data Practices Compliance Official, the District's insurer, risk pool, claims administrator, coverage counsel, or other risk-management provider as applicable, and any District governance/legal-review channel responsible for oversight of Policy 103, Policy 414, Title IX, FERPA, MGDPA, personnel-data authority, student-record access, and maltreatment-report processing.

Please also take or direct the following governance actions:

1. Confirm who is the current Responsible Authority, authorized designee, Data Practices Compliance Official, personnel-data authority, and Title IX Coordinator for the pending HOMS/Title IX access and correction universe.
2. Identify the non-implicated intake, routing, preservation, review, and decision channel that will process this notice and the pending HOMS/Title IX access/correction universe, or explain why the District believes an implicated response channel may remain the sole gatekeeper of disputes about its own conduct.
3. Identify the policy lane used to process this notice, including whether it is handled under Policy 103, routed to another specific policy procedure under Policy 103, or split between specific-policy procedures and the Policy 103 fallback lane.
4. Identify the administrator, investigator, reviewer, or decisionmaker assigned to investigate or follow up on this notice and issue the written outcome/corrective-action response required by Policy 103 or any more specific procedure.
5. Preserve and review the records showing role separation, delegation, independent review, or decisionmaking basis for the Title IX dismissal, closure, appeal posture, and access denial.
6. Preserve and review the records showing intake, routing, Policy 103 processing, Policy 414 analysis, MDE routing/review, parent-notification handling, and the reason the District treated generic Policy 103 as the controlling lane after reviewing Policy 414 for the HOMS Maltreatment Report and related mandated-reporting/failure-to-report allegations.
7. Preserve and review the HOMS Investigation Process / weapons / bullying source, routing, policy-review, safety/accommodation, staff/witness, conclusion, redaction, access, and finality records needed to determine whether those related maintained records require correction, qualification, or separate governance action.
8. Preserve and review the unredacted HOMS Maltreatment conclusion, staff-identity redaction bases, disclosure logs, redaction logs, withholding logs, and any records showing meaningful notice of investigation results/conclusions to the parent.
9. Preserve and review the public-personnel/status records, complaint-existence/status records, no-discipline/no-training records, and underlying investigative records sufficient to reconcile the public-data breadcrumbs concerning the negligent-teacher complaint with the redacted maltreatment report and the District's maintained no-correction/finality posture.
10. Preserve and review records showing whether Scott Peterson, Joe Kuboushek, or any other staff member was investigated for failure to report during the November 1 through November 14 period, including what notifications were considered, what reporting duties were analyzed, whether any report was filed, and what staff-specific finding

or conclusion was reached.

11. Preserve and review the 13.39 determination, chief-legal-attorney designation, litigation-preparation basis, disclosure-log classification record, and any records supporting later all-requests-answered/no-additional-responsive-data finality for that lane.
12. Preserve and review records showing intake, review, consideration, processing, search, source-document touch, appeal-notice transmission, appeal-processing, and pre-denial investigative/search action for later requests and appeal denials in this universe.
13. Determine whether the District should correct, qualify, append a statement of disagreement to, or withdraw any maintained finality, all-records-produced, fulfilled-request, good-faith, burden, nonreciprocity, or nuisance-type statements that rely on unsupported or incomplete record-process claims.
14. Preserve and review the records showing whether the statements of disagreement, accompanying complaints, correction complaints, appeal complaints, and related source documents were searched for, reviewed, discussed, produced, withheld, excluded, or dispositioned before the District maintained Kally/all-responsive-data/all-requests-answered finality.
15. Preserve and review the records showing intake, investigation, source-record comparison, decisionmaking, appeal-right/hearing-right handling, and source support for the correction denial that asserted the challenged HOMS/Title IX data were not inaccurate, incomplete, or misleading, and for the refusal to process the related correction/access submission on the ground that it was not a Title IX complaint.
16. Preserve and review the role-mapping, access-basis, routing, transmission, and bounceback-anomaly records needed to test whether the District's privacy, lawful-access, and finality statements are accurate and complete.
17. Account for the 15 mapped strike items currently tracked against the Title IX summary / dismissal / appeal / access / finality universe, including which have been corrected, denied with source support, appended with a statement of disagreement, routed to hearing/appeal rights, or left pending.
18. Account for all expired, matured, or undispositioned requests that seek records necessary to test the District's HOMS/Title IX source-record, appeal, access, search, processing, role-mapping, privacy, bounceback, and finality claims, including whether each has been produced, denied, withheld with a statutory basis, identified as no responsive data, mapped to a prior production locator, or left pending.
19. Determine what current action is needed to finally and humanely disposition the Title IX, appeal, access, and source-record lanes so the family is not required to keep relitigating the same undispositioned process universe.
20. Route this notice to the District's insurer, risk pool, claims administrator, coverage counsel, or other risk-management provider as applicable, and preserve records showing when and how that routing occurred.
21. Identify what corrective action, training, supervision, reassignment, independent review, external referral, or other governance measure will be used if the record universe cannot support the maintained District posture.

I am asking the Board to stop treating the response channel as if it is outside governance oversight. When the District's own produced universe shows unsupported role separation, unsupported process routing, fully redacted results, unsupported 13.39/chief-legal-attorney claims, and repeated finality/good-faith statements used against a parent seeking records after serious harm to a child, the issue has crossed from records administration into governance accountability. It has also crossed into basic humane administration: a school district should be able to tell a family, clearly and with source support, what happened to a Title IX/child-safety record universe without forcing the family to spend more than a year and a half proving that the question was never properly answered.

Respectfully,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]